

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 4-10 are pending in the application. Claims 4-7 have been amended. Claims 8-10 have been added. Claims 1-3 have been canceled.

#### Response to Objections

The Examiner has objected to the oath or declaration as defective. Applicant respectfully submits that the statement “material to examination” in the previously submitted declaration/oath is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a). Applicant respectfully submits that, as provided by 35 U.S.C §131, the Director shall cause an *examination of an application* and the alleged invention to be made to determine that the applicant is *entitled to a patent under the law* (i.e., determine patentability of the application); and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to a patent under the law, the Director shall issue a patent thereof. See 35 U.S.C. §131, emphasis added. As such, the *examination* of an application is used to determine *patentability* of an application. By implication, the statement “material to examination” is sufficient language to satisfy the requirement that the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be “material to patentability” as defined in 37 C.F.R. 1.56, since *examination* is used to determine *patentability* of an application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that “material to examination” is sufficient, and respectfully requests that the objection to the oath/declaration be withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to because the specification refers to the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification has been amended to correct the informalities, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

#### Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chisholm et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,215,511). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claims.

CLAIMS 10, and 4-7

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over the cited reference because Chisholm does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 10 recites:

A component for gas turbines, comprising:  
a main body; and  
a removable insert configured to be fixed to a zone of the main body, wherein the removable insert is configured to have mechanical properties to withstand stresses to which the component is subjected to in the zone where the insert is arranged, **and wherein the removable insert is configured to be removed from the main body when the removable insert becomes damaged, while retaining the main body that is still fit for operation.** (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 requires that the insert be removable from the main body when the removable insert becomes damaged, while the main body that is still fit for operation is retained. Applicant respectfully submits that Chisholm fails to disclose at least this limitation of the claim.

Chisholm is directed to a gas turbine nozzle vane having both improved thermal shock resistance and improved resistance to deformation under high temperature operating conditions. Chisholm, col.1, lines 10-14. The gas turbine nozzle includes a metallic body member and a heat-resistant non-metallic member fixedly joined thereto and forming at least part of an edge surface of the nozzle vane. Chisholm, col.1, lines 61-67. Although Chisholm discloses that the body members and the edge members are separately formed by such techniques as investment casting, extrusion, etc, nothing in Chisholm discloses that the edge members, which are being as interpreted to be the claimed inserts, are configured to be removable from the main body when the removable insert becomes damaged, while retaining the main body that is still fit for operation, as required by claim 10. As such, Chisholm fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 10.

Furthermore, Chisholm teaches away from using a removable insert because the manufacturing process described in Chisholm results in a composite turbine blade. Chisholm discloses that in the manufacture of the composite vanes, in order to joint the component parts, is to, first, prepare the edge member from the desired heat-resistance material in a form such as shown in the drawing, and then incorporate the edge member as an inert in a wax pattern designed for the body member. The well-known “lost wax” or other technique is then followed to provide a mold in which the metal body member is cast. The resulting *article is a composite turbine blade* having an *edge surface member securely fixed* to the vane. Chisholm, col. 3, lines

11-28, emphasis added. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over the cited reference.

Given that claims 4-7 depend from independent claim 10, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 4-7 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

#### CLAIMS 8 and 9

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference for similar reasons as those described above with respect to claim 10. Given that claim 9 depends from independent claim 8, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 9 is also patentable over the cited reference.

CONCLUSION


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 4-7 as amended and claims 8-10 as added are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8/15/07

By:   
Michael J. Mallie  
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300